



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten Signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,057	03/19/2004	Kia Silverbrook	ZG121US	7055
24011	7590	02/05/2008	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD			CUTLER, ALBERT H	
393 DARLING STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BALMAIN, 2041			2622	
AUSTRALIA				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/05/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/804,057	SILVERBROOK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Albert H. Cutler	2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/113,071.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/19/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to application 10/804,057 filed on March 19, 2004. Claims 1-14 are pending in the application and have been examined by the Examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) mailed on March 19, 2004 was received and has been considered by the examiner.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 specifies a display, and claims, "wherein said display is adapted to display said modified image". Upon examination, the Examiner has been unable to find any instances in the original specification that teach, "wherein said display is adapted to display said **modified image**". Paragraph 0680 of Publication 2005/0122399 reads, "When the "Take" button on an Artcam is half depressed, the TFT will display the current image from the image sensor (converted via a simple VLIW process). Once the Take button is fully depressed, the Taken Image is displayed. When the user presses the Print button and image processing begins, the TFT is turned off. Once the image has been printed the TFT is turned on again." It appears that the display is used to display an image taken by the camera and not a modified image as called for in claim 1.

Claims 2-14 are rejected as depending from a rejected claim 1.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,750,944 in view of Kobayashi et al.(US 5,748,228).

Consider claim 1, US 6,750,944 teaches(see claim 1):

A portable camera including:

- (a) digital image capture device for the capturing of digital images;
- (b) an inbuilt printer device;

(c) a programming language interpreter internally connected to said digital image capture device for the manipulation of a digital image captured by said capture device;

(d) a script input means for inputting a self documenting program script for the manipulation and faltering of said captured digital image to produce visual alterations thereof, said script input means including a card reader for optically reading a script printed as an array of dots on one surface of a portable card;

wherein said script is interpreted and executed by said interpreter means to modify a captured digital image in accordance with said script to produce a digital image modified from said captured digital image, wherein said printer device is adapted to print said modified image(See Claim 1).

However, claim 1 of US 6,750,944 does not explicitly teach a display, wherein said display is adapted to display said modified image.

Kobayashi et al. are similar to US 6,750,944 in that Kobayashi et al. teach a portable camera(figures 3, 4, 7-9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19) including a digital image capture device(2) for capturing digital images(Column 4, lines 1-20). Kobayashi et al. also similarly teach of modifying the captured images(The captured images go through predetermined processes such as magnification, column 6, line 55 through column 7, line 7).

However, in addition to the teachings of US 6,750,944, Kobayashi et al. teach a display(3), wherein said display(3) is adapted to display said modified image(column 6, line 30 through column 7, line 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a display adapted to display modified images as taught by Kobayashi et al. in the portable camera claimed by Silverbrook et al.(US 6,750,944), for the benefit of allowing the user to verify a modified image while still permitting the camera to have excellent portability(Kobayashi et al., column 6, lines 8-20).

Claims 2-14 of the current application are the same as claims 2-14 of US 6,750,944, and are therefore rejected using the rationale stated above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Albert H. Cutler whose telephone number is (571)-270-1460. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (7:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc-Yen Vu can be reached on (571)-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AC



NGOC-YEN VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER